

Response Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116
Serial No. 10/046,710
Docket No: Q68136

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1, 2, 5, and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over newly applied, but previously cited Livshiz et al. (US 2002/0016459) in view of Sandroock (3,844,923). Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Livshiz in view of Sandroock, and further in view of Ikeno et al. (US 5,045,527).

Livshiz discloses a tubular portion 25 and conductive fibers 30 disposed within the tubular portion. It appears that when the tubular portion 25 (wire connecting portion) is placed within a magnetic forming coil 46, the tubular portion 25 is pressed radially by a magnetic force so that the diameter of the tubular portion is reduced. Livshiz at Figs. 2-6 and 85.

With respect to independent claims 1 and 5, it is the Examiner's position that Livshiz discloses a structure in which the diameter of the wire connection portion is uniformly reduced over an entire periphery and an entire length of the wire connection portion. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner in this respect.

In fact, the apparatus 40 of Livshiz cannot press a wire connection portion so that its diameter is uniformly reduced over an entire periphery and an entire length thereof. This is because the shape of the forming coil 46 is not provided at a uniform distance around the assembly 52. Instead, the coils is U-shaped with a gap. Livshiz at Fig. 6. The non-uniform shape of the forming coil produces a non-uniform electrically generated compressing force.

In addition, Sandroock, which the Examiner asserts in an attempt to show a wire with a conductor portion and insulating sheath, does not cure the deficiencies in Livshiz discussed above.

Response Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116
Serial No. 10/046,710
Docket No: Q68136


Conclusion

As such, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of independent claims 1 and 5. In addition, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claims 2 and 6 at least because of their dependency from claims 1 and 5, respectively. Applicants also respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claim 9 at least because of its dependency from claim 5 and because Ikeno, which the Examiner asserts in an attempt to show the use of a rotary swagging machine, does not cure the deficiencies in the combination of Livshiz and Sandroock discussed above.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,


John M. Bird
Registration No. 46,027

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: October 28, 2003